

McNulty, Paul J

From: Sampson, Kyle
Sent: Thursday, February 08, 2007 4:15 PM
To: Goodling, Monica; McNulty, Paul J; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Moschella, William; Hertling, Richard; Scolinos, Tasia
Subject: FW: Letter to Gonzales 2.8.07
Attachments: Document.pdf

My thoughts re the response:

- The full quotation (not the selective quote) of the AG's testimony more fairly represents his views about not asking U.S. Attorney to resign for so-called "political reasons," to wit: "I think I would never, ever make a change in a United States attorney for political reasons or **if it would in any way jeopardize an ongoing serious investigation. I just would not do it**" (emphasis added).
- The DAG's testimony clarifies that asking Cummins to resign, not because of underperformance, but to permit Griffin to serve, is not a "political reason":

SEN. SCHUMER: . . . So here we have the attorney general adamant; here's his quote, "We would never, ever make a change in the U.S. attorney position for political reasons." Then we have now -- for the first time, we learn that Bud Cummins was asked to leave for no reason and we're putting in someone who has all kinds of political connections -- not disqualifiers, obviously, certainly not legally -- and I'm sure it's been done by other administrations as well. But do you believe that firing a well-performing U.S. attorney to make way for a political operative is not a political reason?

MR. MCNULTY: Yes, I believe that's it's **not** a political reason.

SEN. SCHUMER: Okay, could you try to explain yourself there?

MR. MCNULTY: . . . I think that the fact that he had political activities in his background does not speak to the question of his qualifications for being the United States attorney in that district. . . . So he started off with a strong enough resume, and the fact that he was given an opportunity to step in -- . . . [where Cummins] may have already been thinking about leaving at some point anyway. . . . And all those things came together to say in this case, this unique situation, we can make a change and this would still be good for the office.

- Griffin is not an inexperienced prosecutor: he had far more federal prosecution experience (in the Criminal Division and in the U.S. Attorney's Office) than Cummins did when he was appointed, in addition to substantial military prosecution experience.

As for the specific questions:

- The decision to appoint Tim Griffin to be interim U.S. Attorney in the Eastern District of Arkansas was made on or about December 15, 2006, after the second of the Attorney General's telephone conversations with Sen. Pryor. Appointing Griffin to be U.S. Attorney (for the Western District of Arkansas) was first contemplated in the spring of 2004 [Monica, please verify], when Griffin was one of three names recommended by Rep. Boozman to fill the U.S. Attorney vacancy in that district that arose because of the resignation of Tom Gean on [insert date]; ultimately, Griffin withdrew his name from consideration for that appointment. Appointing Griffin to be U.S. Attorney (for the Eastern District of Arkansas) was first contemplated in the spring of 2006 [Monica, please verify], after Griffin had left the employment of the White House due to his being activated for full-time military service.
- I am not aware of anyone (other than Mr. Griffin) lobbying, either inside or outside of the Administration, for appointment. In the spring of 2006 [Monica, please verify], White House Counsel Harriet Miers asked the Department if Mr. Griffin (who then was on active duty) could be considered for appointment as U.S.

Attorney upon his return from Iraq. As Griffin was well known to the Department (from his service in the Criminal Division, the U.S. Attorney's Office, and the White House), this request was considered favorably.

- Cummins' continued service as U.S. Attorney was not considered at the same time as the other U.S. Attorneys that the DAG acknowledged were asked to resign for reasons related to their performance. As the DAG testified, with regard to Cummins' continued service, "there was a change made there that was not connected to, as was said, the performance of the incumbent, but more related to the opportunity to provide a fresh start with a new person in that position." (Or where the DAG testified that he was "not disputing [the] characterization" that Cummins was "fired simply to let someone else have a shot at the job.")
- I am not aware of Karl Rove playing any role in the Attorney General's decision to appoint Griffin.
- Agree wholeheartedly that "[o]nce appointed, U.S. Attorneys, perhaps more than any other public servance, must be above politics and beyond reproach; they must be seen to enforce the rule of law without fear or favor." Historically, many U.S. Attorneys, prior to their appointment have political experience.
- Hertling should sign.

From: Scott-Finan, Nancy

Sent: Thursday, February 08, 2007 1:25 PM

To: Sampson, Kyle; Goodling, Monica; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Moschella, William; Hertling, Richard; Seidel, Rebecca; Scolinos, Tasia

Cc: Cabral, Catalina; Long, Linda E; Green, Saralene E

Subject: FW: Letter to Gonzales 2.8.07

Senator Schumer's press secretary just emailed me this Schumer/Reid/Durbin/Murray letter with regard to Cummins/Griffin.

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, DC 20510

February 8, 2007

The Honorable Alberto R. Gonzales
Attorney General of the United States
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530-0001

Dear Attorney General Gonzales:

As you know, the Senate Judiciary Committee held a hearing this week to examine the growing politicization of the hiring and firing of United States Attorneys, our nation's top federal prosecutors.

Unfortunately, the hearing only served to intensify, rather than assuage, our concerns, particularly given the circumstances surrounding the ouster of Bud Cummins, who was the U.S. Attorney in the Eastern District of Arkansas until last December.

When you testified before the Committee on January 18, 2007, you stated unequivocally that you "would never, ever make a change in a U.S. Attorney position for political reasons." In a stunning admission, however, Deputy Attorney General Paul McNulty, in his own testimony on February 6th, acknowledged that Mr. Cummins was pushed out for no reason other than to install – without Senate confirmation – Tim Griffin, a former aide to Karl Rove. At the time, Mr. Griffin had minimal federal prosecution experience, but was highly skilled in opposition research and partisan attacks for the Republican National Committee. This strikes us as a quintessentially "political" reason to make a change.

We recognize, of course, that United States Attorneys serve at the pleasure of the President, but as several highly respected and distinguished former officials of the Department of Justice have noted, the dismissal of a well-respected U.S. Attorney simply to reward an inexperienced partisan is unprecedented.

Although Senators expect soon to be briefed privately about the alleged performance issues of several other U.S. Attorneys, we hope that you will quickly and publicly address the most troubling aspects of the Cummins ouster and Griffin appointment. We look forward to a fuller explanation of why a concededly well-performing prosecutor was terminated in favor of such a partisan figure:

- In particular, when was the decision made to appoint Tim Griffin to replace Bud Cummins?

DAG000002230

- Specifically, who lobbied on behalf of Tim Griffin's appointment, both inside and outside the Administration?
- Why was Bud Cummins told to resign in June of 2006, when the other dismissed officials were told in December of 2006? Was the reason to give the replacement, Tim Griffin, a chance to become ensconced at the U.S. Attorney's Office in Arkansas before making the appointment?
- In light of the unprecedented nature of the appointment, we are especially interested in understanding the role played by Karl Rove. In particular, what role did Karl Rove, with whom Griffin was closely associated, play in the decision to appoint Griffin?

Given that Mr. Rove was himself apparently still being investigated by a U.S. Attorney in June of 2006, it would be extremely untoward if he were at the same time leading the charge to oust a sitting U.S. Attorney and install his own former aide.

These questions go to the heart of the public's confidence in the fair administration of justice. Once appointed, U.S. Attorneys, perhaps more than any other public servant, must be above politics and beyond reproach; they must be seen to enforce the rule of law without fear or favor.


Given the issues raised in the recent hearing, we are naturally concerned about the Administration's professed commitment to keeping politics out of the Department of Justice. We hope that you will quickly put those concerns to rest.

Sincerely,









McNulty, Paul J

From: Sampson, Kyle
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2007 7:22 PM
To: McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Margolis, David; Hertling, Richard; Goodling, Monica
Subject: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin
Importance: High
Attachments: reid letter re cummins-griffin.doc

All, can you please review and provide comments on my draft response to the above-referenced letter? Richard, can you send the .pdf version of the above-referenced letter around to this group?
Thanks!



reid letter re
cummins-griffin...

Kyle Sampson
Chief of Staff
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530
(202) 514-2001 wk.
(202) 305-5289 cell
kyle.sampson@usdoj.gov

The Honorable Harry Reid
Majority Leader
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Reid:

This is in response to your letter to the Attorney General dated February 8, 2007. An identical response has been sent to the other signatories of that letter.

The full quotation of the Attorney General's testimony at the Judiciary Committee hearing on January 18, 2007 (not the selective quote cited in your letter), more fairly represents his views about the appropriate reasons for asking a U.S. Attorney to resign. In full, the Attorney General stated: "I think I would never, ever make a change in a United States attorney for political reasons or *if it would in any way jeopardize an ongoing serious investigation. I just would not do it*" (emphasis added).

The Deputy Attorney General, at the hearing held on February 6, 2007, further stated the Department's view that asking U.S. Attorney Bud Cummins to resign so that Special Assistant U.S. Attorney Tim Griffin might have the opportunity to serve as U.S. Attorney is not, in the Department's view, an inappropriate "political reason." This is so, the Deputy Attorney General testified because, *inter alia*, Griffin was very well-qualified and had "a strong enough resume" to serve as U.S. Attorney, and Cummins "may have already been thinking about leaving at some point anyway." Indeed, at the time Griffin was appointed interim U.S. Attorney in December 2006 he had far more federal prosecution experience (in the Criminal Division and in the U.S. Attorney's office) than Cummins did at the time he was appointed U.S. Attorney in [insert month] 2001. In addition, Griffin has substantial military prosecution experience that Cummins does not have. And it was well-known, as early as December 2004, that Cummins intended to leave the office and seek employment in the private sector. *See* "The Insider Dec. 30," *Ark. Times* (Dec. 30, 2004) ("Cummins, 45, said that, with four children to put through college someday, he'll likely begin exploring career options. It wouldn't be 'shocking,' he said, for there to be a change in his office before the end of Bush's second term.").

In answer to your specific questions:

- The decision to appoint Tim Griffin to be interim U.S. Attorney in the Eastern District of Arkansas was made on or about December 15, 2006, after the second of the Attorney General's telephone conversations with Senator Pryor.
- The Department of Justice is not aware of anyone lobbying, either inside or outside of the Administration, for Griffin's appointment. In the spring of 2006,

DAG000002233

following regular procedures, the Office of the Counsel to the President inquired of the Office of the Attorney General as to whether Griffin (who then was on active military duty) might be considered for appointment as U.S. Attorney upon his return from Iraq.

- As the Deputy Attorney General testified, Cummins' continued service as U.S. Attorney was not considered at the same time as the other U.S. Attorneys that the Deputy Attorney General acknowledged were asked to resign for reasons related to their performance. As the Deputy Attorney General testified, the request that Cummins resign was "related to the opportunity to provide a fresh start with a new person in that position."
- The Department is not aware of Karl Rove playing any role in the decision to appoint Griffin.

In conclusion, the Department wholeheartedly agrees with the principle that "[o]nce appointed, U.S. Attorneys, perhaps more than any other public servants, must be above politics and beyond reproach; they must be seen to enforce the rule of law without fear or favor." That many U.S. Attorneys, appointed by Presidents of both parties, have had political experience prior to their appointment does not undermine that principle.

Sincerely,

Richard A. Hertling
Acting Assistant Attorney General

McNulty, Paul J

From: Goodling, Monica
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 12:01 PM
To: Sampson, Kyle; Margolis, David; McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Hertling, Richard
Subject: RE: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin

He was technically an employee of Crim Div from March 2001 to June 2002, but was on detail to EDAR for September 2001-June 2002 -- so about 6 months in Crim Div.

From: Sampson, Kyle
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 10:16 AM
To: Margolis, David; McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Hertling, Richard; Goodling, Monica
Subject: RE: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin

Monica, can you tell us how long Tim was in CRM?

From: Margolis, David
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 9:23 AM
To: Sampson, Kyle; McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Hertling, Richard; Goodling, Monica
Subject: RE: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin

Kyle: remind me - did Tim spend a substantial period of time in Crm Div.? I just don't recall. Otherwise I have no qualms about the letter.

From: Sampson, Kyle
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2007 7:22 PM
To: McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Margolis, David; Hertling, Richard; Goodling, Monica
Subject: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin
Importance: High

All, can you please review and provide comments on my draft response to the above-referenced letter?
Richard, can you send the .pdf version of the above-referenced letter around to this group?
Thanks!

<< File: reid letter re cummins-griffin.doc >>

Kyle Sampson
Chief of Staff
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530
(202) 514-2001 wk.
(202) 305-5289 cell
kyle.sampson@usdoj.gov

McNulty, Paul J

From: Sampson, Kyle
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 12:03 PM
To: Goodling, Monica; Margolis, David; McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Hertling, Richard
Subject: RE: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin
Importance: High
Attachments: reid letter re cummins-griffin v.2.doc

If you have not already reviewed the letter, please review this version 2. (It includes some nits, plus a new graf from Hertling.) Because this letter mentions Rove and alludes to Harriet, I'd like to send it to WHCO today for their review, with an eye on getting it out tomorrow. THx.



reid letter re
cummins-griffin...

From: Goodling, Monica
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 12:01 PM
To: Sampson, Kyle; Margolis, David; McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Hertling, Richard
Subject: RE: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin

He was technically an employee of Crim Div from March 2001 to June 2002, but was on detail to EDAR for September 2001-June 2002 -- so about 6 months in Crim Div.

From: Sampson, Kyle
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 10:16 AM
To: Margolis, David; McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Hertling, Richard; Goodling, Monica
Subject: RE: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin

Monica, can you tell us how long Tim was in CRM?

From: Margolis, David
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 9:23 AM
To: Sampson, Kyle; McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Hertling, Richard; Goodling, Monica
Subject: RE: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin

Kyle: remind me - did Tim spend a substantial period of time in Crm Div.? I just don't recall. Otherwise I have no qualms about the letter.

From: Sampson, Kyle
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2007 7:22 PM
To: McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Margolis, David; Hertling, Richard; Goodling, Monica
Subject: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin
Importance: High

All, can you please review and provide comments on my draft response to the above-referenced letter?
Richard, can you send the .pdf version of the above-referenced letter around to this group?
Thanks!

<< File: reid letter re cummins-griffin.doc >>

Kyle Sampson
Chief of Staff
U.S. Department of Justice

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530
(202) 514-2001 wk.
(202) 305-5289 cell
kyle.sampson@usdoj.gov

The Honorable Harry Reid
Majority Leader
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Reid:

This is in response to your letter to the Attorney General dated February 8, 2007. An identical response has been sent to the other signatories of that letter.

The full quotation of the Attorney General's testimony at the Judiciary Committee hearing on January 18, 2007 (not the selective quote cited in your letter), more fairly represents his views about the appropriate reasons for asking a U.S. Attorney to resign. In full, the Attorney General stated: "I think I would never, ever make a change in a United States attorney for political reasons or *if it would in any way jeopardize an ongoing serious investigation. I just would not do it*" (emphasis added).

The Deputy Attorney General, at the hearing held on February 6, 2007, further stated the Department's view that asking U.S. Attorney Bud Cummins to resign so that Special Assistant U.S. Attorney Tim Griffin might have the opportunity to serve as U.S. Attorney is not, in the Department's view, an inappropriate "political reason." This is so, the Deputy Attorney General testified because, *inter alia*, Mr. Griffin is very well-qualified and has "a strong enough resume" to serve as U.S. Attorney, and Mr. Cummins "may have already been thinking about leaving at some point anyway." Indeed, at the time Mr. Griffin was appointed interim U.S. Attorney in December 2006 he had far more federal prosecution experience (in the Criminal Division and in the U.S. Attorney's office) than Mr. Cummins did at the time he was confirmed as U.S. Attorney in December 2001. In addition, Mr. Griffin has substantial military prosecution experience that Mr. Cummins does not have. And it was well-known, as early as December 2004, that Mr. Cummins intended to leave the office and seek employment in the private sector. See "The Insider Dec. 30," *Ark. Times* (Dec. 30, 2004) ("Cummins, 45, said that, with four children to put through college someday, he'll likely begin exploring career options. It wouldn't be 'shocking,' he said, for there to be a change in his office before the end of Bush's second term.").

In addition, the Department does not consider the replacement of one Republican U.S. Attorney by another well-qualified person with extensive experience as a prosecutor and strong ties to the district to be a change made for "political reasons." U.S. Attorneys serve at the pleasure of the President; that has always been the rule, and U.S. Attorneys accept their appointment with that understanding. U.S. Attorneys leave office all the time for a wide variety of reasons. As noted in the case of Mr. Cummins, he had previously

DAG000002238

indicated publicly that he did not expect to remain in office through the President's second term. It was only natural and appropriate that the Department would seek a successor in anticipation of the potential vacancy. When the Department found an able and experienced successor, it moved forward with his interim appointment.

In answer to your specific questions:

- The decision to appoint Tim Griffin to be interim U.S. Attorney in the Eastern District of Arkansas was made on or about December 15, 2006, after the second of the Attorney General's telephone conversations with Senator Pryor.
- The Department of Justice is not aware of anyone lobbying, either inside or outside of the Administration, for Mr. Griffin's appointment. In the spring of 2006, following regular procedures, the Office of the Counsel to the President inquired of the Office of the Attorney General as to whether Mr. Griffin (who then was on active military duty in Iraq) might be considered for appointment as U.S. Attorney upon his return.
- As the Deputy Attorney General testified, Mr. Cummins's continued service as U.S. Attorney was not considered at the same time as the other U.S. Attorneys that the Deputy Attorney General acknowledged were asked to resign for reasons related to their performance. As the Deputy Attorney General testified, the request that Mr. Cummins resign was "related to the opportunity to provide a fresh start with a new person in that position."
- The Department is not aware of Karl Rove playing any role in the decision to appoint Mr. Griffin.

In conclusion, the Department wholeheartedly agrees with the principle you set forth in your letter that "[o]nce appointed, U.S. Attorneys, perhaps more than any other public servants, must be above politics and beyond reproach; they must be seen to enforce the rule of law without fear or favor." That many U.S. Attorneys, appointed by Presidents of both parties, have had political experience prior to their appointment does not undermine that principle.

We appreciate the opportunity to respond to your inquiry.

Sincerely,

Richard A. Hertling
Acting Assistant Attorney General

DAG000002239

McNulty, Paul J

From: Hertling, Richard
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 10:18 AM
To: Sampson, Kyle; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Margolis, David; Goodling, Monica; McNulty, Paul J
Subject: FW: Schumer/Reid/Durbin/Murray 2/8/07 Letter Re USA Bud Cummins
Attachments: Schumer.Reid.Durbin.Murray 2.8.07 Letter Re USA Bud Cummins.pdf

As Kyle requested, here is the letter to which the draft letter on Griffin circulated last night responds.

From: Cabral, Catalina
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 10:11 AM
To: Hertling, Richard
Subject: Schumer/Reid/Durbin/Murray 2/8/07 Letter Re USA Bud Cummins



Schumer.Reid.Durbin.Murray 2.8...

Catalina Cabral
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
Office of Legislative Affairs
Catalina.Cabral@USDOJ.gov
(202) 514-4828

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, DC 20510

February 8, 2007

The Honorable Alberto R. Gonzales
Attorney General of the United States
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530-0001

Dear Attorney General Gonzales:

As you know, the Senate Judiciary Committee held a hearing this week to examine the growing politicization of the hiring and firing of United States Attorneys, our nation's top federal prosecutors.

Unfortunately, the hearing only served to intensify, rather than assuage, our concerns, particularly given the circumstances surrounding the ouster of Bud Cummins, who was the U.S. Attorney in the Eastern District of Arkansas until last December.

When you testified before the Committee on January 18, 2007, you stated unequivocally that you "would never, ever make a change in a U.S. Attorney position for political reasons." In a stunning admission, however, Deputy Attorney General Paul McNulty, in his own testimony on February 6th, acknowledged that Mr. Cummins was pushed out for no reason other than to install – without Senate confirmation – Tim Griffin, a former aide to Karl Rove. At the time, Mr. Griffin had minimal federal prosecution experience, but was highly skilled in opposition research and partisan attacks for the Republican National Committee. This strikes us as a quintessentially "political" reason to make a change.

We recognize, of course, that United States Attorneys serve at the pleasure of the President, but as several highly respected and distinguished former officials of the Department of Justice have noted, the dismissal of a well-respected U.S. Attorney simply to reward an inexperienced partisan is unprecedented.

Although Senators expect soon to be briefed privately about the alleged performance issues of several other U.S. Attorneys, we hope that you will quickly and publicly address the most troubling aspects of the Cummins ouster and Griffin appointment. We look forward to a fuller explanation of why a concededly well-performing prosecutor was terminated in favor of such a partisan figure:

- In particular, when was the decision made to appoint Tim Griffin to replace Bud Cummins?


- Specifically, who lobbied on behalf of Tim Griffin's appointment, both inside and outside the Administration?
- Why was Bud Cummins told to resign in June of 2006, when the other dismissed officials were told in December of 2006? Was the reason to give the replacement, Tim Griffin, a chance to become ensconced at the U.S. Attorney's Office in Arkansas before making the appointment?
- In light of the unprecedented nature of the appointment, we are especially interested in understanding the role played by Karl Rove. In particular, what role did Karl Rove, with whom Griffin was closely associated, play in the decision to appoint Griffin?


Given that Mr. Rove was himself apparently still being investigated by a U.S. Attorney in June of 2006, it would be extremely untoward if he were at the same time leading the charge to oust a sitting U.S. Attorney and install his own former aide.

These questions go to the heart of the public's confidence in the fair administration of justice. Once appointed, U.S. Attorneys, perhaps more than any other public servant, must be above politics and beyond reproach; they must be seen to enforce the rule of law without fear or favor.


Given the issues raised in the recent hearing, we are naturally concerned about the Administration's professed commitment to keeping politics out of the Department of Justice. We hope that you will quickly put those concerns to rest.

Sincerely,









McNulty, Paul J

From: Moschella, William
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 3:20 PM
To: Sampson, Kyle; Goodling, Monica; Margolis, David; McNulty, Paul J; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Hertling, Richard
Subject: RE: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin

No objection but would copy Specter and McConnell.

From: Sampson, Kyle
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 12:03 PM
To: Goodling, Monica; Margolis, David; McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Hertling, Richard
Subject: RE: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin
Importance: High

If you have not already reviewed the letter, please review this version 2. (It includes some nits, plus a new graf from Hertling.) Because this letter mentions Rove and alludes to Harriet, I'd like to send it to WHCO today for their review, with an eye on getting it out tomorrow. THx.

<< File: reid letter re cummins-griffin v.2.doc >>

From: Goodling, Monica
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 12:01 PM
To: Sampson, Kyle; Margolis, David; McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Hertling, Richard
Subject: RE: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin

He was technically an employee of Crim Div from March 2001 to June 2002, but was on detail to EDAR for September 2001-June 2002 -- so about 6 months in Crim Div.

From: Sampson, Kyle
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 10:16 AM
To: Margolis, David; McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Hertling, Richard; Goodling, Monica
Subject: RE: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin

Monica, can you tell us how long Tim was in CRM?

From: Margolis, David
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 9:23 AM
To: Sampson, Kyle; McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Hertling, Richard; Goodling, Monica
Subject: RE: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin

Kyle: remind me - did Tim spend a substantial period of time in Crm Div.? I just don't recall. Otherwise I have no qualms about the letter.

From: Sampson, Kyle
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2007 7:22 PM
To: McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Margolis, David; Hertling, Richard; Goodling, Monica
Subject: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin
Importance: High

All, can you please review and provide comments on my draft response to the above-referenced letter?
Richard, can you send the .pdf version of the above-referenced letter around to this group?
Thanks!

<< File: reid letter re cummins-griffin.doc >>

Kyle Sampson
Chief of Staff
U.S. Department of Justice

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530
(202) 514-2001 wk.
(202) 305-5289 cell
kyle.sampson@usdoj.gov

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, DC 20510

February 8, 2007

The Honorable Alberto R. Gonzales
Attorney General of the United States
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530-0001

Dear Attorney General Gonzales:

As you know, the Senate Judiciary Committee held a hearing this week to examine the growing politicization of the hiring and firing of United States Attorneys, our nation's top federal prosecutors.

Unfortunately, the hearing only served to intensify, rather than assuage, our concerns, particularly given the circumstances surrounding the ouster of Bud Cummins, who was the U.S. Attorney in the Eastern District of Arkansas until last December.

When you testified before the Committee on January 18, 2007, you stated unequivocally that you "would never, ever make a change in a U.S. Attorney position for political reasons." In a stunning admission, however, Deputy Attorney General Paul McNulty, in his own testimony on February 6th, acknowledged that Mr. Cummins was pushed out for no reason other than to install – without Senate confirmation – Tim Griffin, a former aide to Karl Rove. At the time, Mr. Griffin had minimal federal prosecution experience, but was highly skilled in opposition research and partisan attacks for the Republican National Committee. This strikes us as a quintessentially "political" reason to make a change.

We recognize, of course, that United States Attorneys serve at the pleasure of the President, but as several highly respected and distinguished former officials of the Department of Justice have noted, the dismissal of a well-respected U.S. Attorney simply to reward an inexperienced partisan is unprecedented.

Although Senators expect soon to be briefed privately about the alleged performance issues of several other U.S. Attorneys, we hope that you will quickly and publicly address the most troubling aspects of the Cummins ouster and Griffin appointment. We look forward to a fuller explanation of why a concededly well-performing prosecutor was terminated in favor of such a partisan figure:

- In particular, when was the decision made to appoint Tim Griffin to replace Bud Cummins?

DAG000002245

- Specifically, who lobbied on behalf of Tim Griffin's appointment, both inside and outside the Administration?
- Why was Bud Cummins told to resign in June of 2006, when the other dismissed officials were told in December of 2006? Was the reason to give the replacement, Tim Griffin, a chance to become ensconced at the U.S. Attorney's Office in Arkansas before making the appointment?
- In light of the unprecedented nature of the appointment, we are especially interested in understanding the role played by Karl Rove. In particular, what role did Karl Rove, with whom Griffin was closely associated, play in the decision to appoint Griffin?

Given that Mr. Rove was himself apparently still being investigated by a U.S. Attorney in June of 2006, it would be extremely untoward if he were at the same time leading the charge to oust a sitting U.S. Attorney and install his own former aide.

These questions go to the heart of the public's confidence in the fair administration of justice. Once appointed, U.S. Attorneys, perhaps more than any other public servant, must be above politics and beyond reproach; they must be seen to enforce the rule of law without fear or favor.

Given the issues raised in the recent hearing, we are naturally concerned about the Administration's professed commitment to keeping politics out of the Department of Justice. We hope that you will quickly put those concerns to rest.

Sincerely,

Garry
Chase

Dick Durbin
Patty Murray

Elston, Michael (ODAG)

From: Scott-Finan, Nancy
Sent: Thursday, February 08, 2007 1:25 PM
To: Sampson, Kyle; Goodling, Monica; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Moschella, William; Hertling, Richard; Seidel, Rebecca; Scolinos, Tasia
Cc: Cabral, Catalina; Long, Linda E; Green, Saralene E
Subject: FW: Letter to Gonzales 2.8.07
Attachments: Document.pdf

Senator Schumer's press secretary just emailed me this Schumer/Reid/Durbin/Murray letter with regard to Cummins/Griffin.

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, DC 20510

February 8, 2007

The Honorable Alberto R. Gonzales
Attorney General of the United States
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530-0001

Dear Attorney General Gonzales:

As you know, the Senate Judiciary Committee held a hearing this week to examine the growing politicization of the hiring and firing of United States Attorneys, our nation's top federal prosecutors.

Unfortunately, the hearing only served to intensify, rather than assuage, our concerns, particularly given the circumstances surrounding the ouster of Bud Cummins, who was the U.S. Attorney in the Eastern District of Arkansas until last December.

When you testified before the Committee on January 18, 2007, you stated unequivocally that you "would never, ever make a change in a U.S. Attorney position for political reasons." In a stunning admission, however, Deputy Attorney General Paul McNulty, in his own testimony on February 6th, acknowledged that Mr. Cummins was pushed out for no reason other than to install – without Senate confirmation – Tim Griffin, a former aide to Karl Rove. At the time, Mr. Griffin had minimal federal prosecution experience, but was highly skilled in opposition research and partisan attacks for the Republican National Committee. This strikes us as a quintessentially "political" reason to make a change.

We recognize, of course, that United States Attorneys serve at the pleasure of the President, but as several highly respected and distinguished former officials of the Department of Justice have noted, the dismissal of a well-respected U.S. Attorney simply to reward an inexperienced partisan is unprecedented.

Although Senators expect soon to be briefed privately about the alleged performance issues of several other U.S. Attorneys, we hope that you will quickly and publicly address the most troubling aspects of the Cummins ouster and Griffin appointment. We look forward to a fuller explanation of why a concededly well-performing prosecutor was terminated in favor of such a partisan figure:

- In particular, when was the decision made to appoint Tim Griffin to replace Bud Cummins?

DAG000002248


- Specifically, who lobbied on behalf of Tim Griffin's appointment, both inside and outside the Administration?
- Why was Bud Cummins told to resign in June of 2006, when the other dismissed officials were told in December of 2006? Was the reason to give the replacement, Tim Griffin, a chance to become ensconced at the U.S. Attorney's Office in Arkansas before making the appointment?
- In light of the unprecedented nature of the appointment, we are especially interested in understanding the role played by Karl Rove. In particular, what role did Karl Rove, with whom Griffin was closely associated, play in the decision to appoint Griffin?


Given that Mr. Rove was himself apparently still being investigated by a U.S. Attorney in June of 2006, it would be extremely untoward if he were at the same time leading the charge to oust a sitting U.S. Attorney and install his own former aide.

These questions go to the heart of the public's confidence in the fair administration of justice. Once appointed, U.S. Attorneys, perhaps more than any other public servant, must be above politics and beyond reproach; they must be seen to enforce the rule of law without fear or favor.


Given the issues raised in the recent hearing, we are naturally concerned about the Administration's professed commitment to keeping politics out of the Department of Justice. We hope that you will quickly put those concerns to rest.

Sincerely,









Elston, Michael (ODAG)

From: Sampson, Kyle
Sent: Thursday, February 08, 2007 4:15 PM
To: Goodling, Monica; McNulty, Paul J; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Moschella, William; Hertling, Richard; Scolinos, Tasia
Subject: FW: Letter to Gonzales 2.8.07
Attachments: Document.pdf

My thoughts re the response:

- The full quotation (not the selective quote) of the AG's testimony more fairly represents his views about not asking U.S. Attorney to resign for so-called "political reasons," to wit: "I think I would never, ever make a change in a United States attorney for political reasons or **if it would in any way jeopardize an ongoing serious investigation. I just would not do it**" (emphasis added).
- The DAG's testimony clarifies that asking Cummins to resign, not because of underperformance, but to permit Griffin to serve, is not a "political reason":

SEN. SCHUMER: . . . So here we have the attorney general adamant; here's his quote, "We would never, ever make a change in the U.S. attorney position for political reasons." Then we have now -- for the first time, we learn that Bud Cummins was asked to leave for no reason and we're putting in someone who has all kinds of political connections -- not disqualifiers, obviously, certainly not legally -- and I'm sure it's been done by other administrations as well. But do you believe that firing a well-performing U.S. attorney to make way for a political operative is not a political reason?

MR. MCNULTY: Yes, I believe that's it's **not** a political reason.

SEN. SCHUMER: Okay, could you try to explain yourself there?

MR. MCNULTY: . . . I think that the fact that he had political activities in his background does not speak to the question of his qualifications for being the United States attorney in that district. . . . So he started off with a strong enough resume, and the fact that he was given an opportunity to step in -- . . . [where Cummins] may have already been thinking about leaving at some point anyway. . . . And all those things came together to say in this case, this unique situation, we can make a change and this would still be good for the office.

- Griffin is not an inexperienced prosecutor: he had far more federal prosecution experience (in the Criminal Division and in the U.S. Attorney's Office) than Cummins did when he was appointed, in addition to substantial military prosecution experience.

As for the specific questions:

- The decision to appoint Tim Griffin to be interim U.S. Attorney in the Eastern District of Arkansas was made on or about December 15, 2006, after the second of the Attorney General's telephone conversations with Sen. Pryor. Appointing Griffin to be U.S. Attorney (for the Western District of Arkansas) was first contemplated in the spring of 2004 [Monica, please verify], when Griffin was one of three names recommended by Rep. Boozman to fill the U.S. Attorney vacancy in that district that arose because of the resignation of Tom Gean on [insert date]; ultimately, Griffin withdrew his name from consideration for that appointment. Appointing Griffin to be U.S. Attorney (for the Eastern District of Arkansas) was first contemplated in the spring of 2006 [Monica, please verify], after Griffin had left the employment of the White House due to his being activated for full-time military service.
- I am not aware of anyone (other than Mr. Griffin) lobbying, either inside or outside of the Administration, for appointment. In the spring of 2006 [Monica, please verify], White House Counsel Harriet Miers asked the Department if Mr. Griffin (who then was on active duty) could be considered for appointment as U.S.

Attorney upon his return from Iraq. As Griffin was well known to the Department (from his service in the Criminal Division, the U.S. Attorney's Office, and the White House), this request was considered favorably.

- Cummins' continued service as U.S. Attorney was not considered at the same time as the other U.S. Attorneys that the DAG acknowledged were asked to resign for reasons related to their performance. As the DAG testified, with regard to Cummins' continued service, "there was a change made there that was not connected to, as was said, the performance of the incumbent, but more related to the opportunity to provide a fresh start with a new person in that position." (Or where the DAG testified that he was "not disputing [the] characterization" that Cummins was "fired simply to let someone else have a shot at the job.")
- I am not aware of Karl Rove playing any role in the Attorney General's decision to appoint Griffin.
- Agree wholeheartedly that "[o]nce appointed, U.S. Attorneys, perhaps more than any other public servance, must be above politics and beyond reproach; they must be seen to enforce the rule of law without fear or favor." Historically, many U.S. Attorneys, prior to their appointment have political experience.
- Hertling should sign.

From: Scott-Finan, Nancy

Sent: Thursday, February 08, 2007 1:25 PM

To: Sampson, Kyle; Goodling, Monica; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Moschella, William; Hertling, Richard; Seidel, Rebecca; Scolinos, Tasia

Cc: Cabral, Catalina; Long, Linda E; Green, Saralene E

Subject: FW: Letter to Gonzales 2.8.07

Senator Schumer's press secretary just emailed me this Schumer/Reid/Durbin/Murray letter with regard to Cummins/Griffin.

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, DC 20510

February 8, 2007

The Honorable Alberto R. Gonzales
Attorney General of the United States
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530-0001

Dear Attorney General Gonzales:

As you know, the Senate Judiciary Committee held a hearing this week to examine the growing politicization of the hiring and firing of United States Attorneys, our nation's top federal prosecutors.

Unfortunately, the hearing only served to intensify, rather than assuage, our concerns, particularly given the circumstances surrounding the ouster of Bud Cummins, who was the U.S. Attorney in the Eastern District of Arkansas until last December.

When you testified before the Committee on January 18, 2007, you stated unequivocally that you "would never, ever make a change in a U.S. Attorney position for political reasons." In a stunning admission, however, Deputy Attorney General Paul McNulty, in his own testimony on February 6th, acknowledged that Mr. Cummins was pushed out for no reason other than to install – without Senate confirmation – Tim Griffin, a former aide to Karl Rove. At the time, Mr. Griffin had minimal federal prosecution experience, but was highly skilled in opposition research and partisan attacks for the Republican National Committee. This strikes us as a quintessentially "political" reason to make a change.

We recognize, of course, that United States Attorneys serve at the pleasure of the President, but as several highly respected and distinguished former officials of the Department of Justice have noted, the dismissal of a well-respected U.S. Attorney simply to reward an inexperienced partisan is unprecedented.

Although Senators expect soon to be briefed privately about the alleged performance issues of several other U.S. Attorneys, we hope that you will quickly and publicly address the most troubling aspects of the Cummins ouster and Griffin appointment. We look forward to a fuller explanation of why a concededly well-performing prosecutor was terminated in favor of such a partisan figure:

- In particular, when was the decision made to appoint Tim Griffin to replace Bud Cummins?

DAG000002252

- Specifically, who lobbied on behalf of Tim Griffin's appointment, both inside and outside the Administration?
- Why was Bud Cummins told to resign in June of 2006, when the other dismissed officials were told in December of 2006? Was the reason to give the replacement, Tim Griffin, a chance to become ensconced at the U.S. Attorney's Office in Arkansas before making the appointment?
- In light of the unprecedented nature of the appointment, we are especially interested in understanding the role played by Karl Rove. In particular, what role did Karl Rove, with whom Griffin was closely associated, play in the decision to appoint Griffin?


Given that Mr. Rove was himself apparently still being investigated by a U.S. Attorney in June of 2006, it would be extremely untoward if he were at the same time leading the charge to oust a sitting U.S. Attorney and install his own former aide.


These questions go to the heart of the public's confidence in the fair administration of justice. Once appointed, U.S. Attorneys, perhaps more than any other public servant, must be above politics and beyond reproach; they must be seen to enforce the rule of law without fear or favor.


Given the issues raised in the recent hearing, we are naturally concerned about the Administration's professed commitment to keeping politics out of the Department of Justice. We hope that you will quickly put those concerns to rest.

Sincerely,









Elston, Michael (ODAG)

From: Sampson, Kyle
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2007 7:22 PM
To: McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Margolis, David; Hertling, Richard; Goodling, Monica
Subject: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin
Importance: High
Attachments: reid letter re cummins-griffin.doc

All, can you please review and provide comments on my draft response to the above-referenced letter? Richard, can you send the .pdf version of the above-referenced letter around to this group?
Thanks!



reid letter re
cummins-griffin...

Kyle Sampson
Chief of Staff
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530
(202) 514-2001 wk.
(202) 305-5289 cell
kyle.sampson@usdoj.gov

The Honorable Harry Reid
Majority Leader
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Reid:

This is in response to your letter to the Attorney General dated February 8, 2007. An identical response has been sent to the other signatories of that letter.

The full quotation of the Attorney General's testimony at the Judiciary Committee hearing on January 18, 2007 (not the selective quote cited in your letter), more fairly represents his views about the appropriate reasons for asking a U.S. Attorney to resign. In full, the Attorney General stated: "I think I would never, ever make a change in a United States attorney for political reasons or *if it would in any way jeopardize an ongoing serious investigation. I just would not do it*" (emphasis added).

The Deputy Attorney General, at the hearing held on February 6, 2007, further stated the Department's view that asking U.S. Attorney Bud Cummins to resign so that Special Assistant U.S. Attorney Tim Griffin might have the opportunity to serve as U.S. Attorney is not, in the Department's view, an inappropriate "political reason." This is so, the Deputy Attorney General testified because, *inter alia*, Griffin was very well-qualified and had "a strong enough resume" to serve as U.S. Attorney, and Cummins "may have already been thinking about leaving at some point anyway." Indeed, at the time Griffin was appointed interim U.S. Attorney in December 2006 he had far more federal prosecution experience (in the Criminal Division and in the U.S. Attorney's office) than Cummins did at the time he was appointed U.S. Attorney in [insert month] 2001. In addition, Griffin has substantial military prosecution experience that Cummins does not have. And it was well-known, as early as December 2004, that Cummins intended to leave the office and seek employment in the private sector. See "The Insider Dec. 30," *Ark. Times* (Dec. 30, 2004) ("Cummins, 45, said that, with four children to put through college someday, he'll likely begin exploring career options. It wouldn't be 'shocking,' he said, for there to be a change in his office before the end of Bush's second term.").

In answer to your specific questions:

- The decision to appoint Tim Griffin to be interim U.S. Attorney in the Eastern District of Arkansas was made on or about December 15, 2006, after the second of the Attorney General's telephone conversations with Senator Pryor.
- The Department of Justice is not aware of anyone lobbying, either inside or outside of the Administration, for Griffin's appointment. In the spring of 2006,

DAG000002255

following regular procedures, the Office of the Counsel to the President inquired of the Office of the Attorney General as to whether Griffin (who then was on active military duty) might be considered for appointment as U.S. Attorney upon his return from Iraq.

- As the Deputy Attorney General testified, Cummins' continued service as U.S. Attorney was not considered at the same time as the other U.S. Attorneys that the Deputy Attorney General acknowledged were asked to resign for reasons related to their performance. As the Deputy Attorney General testified, the request that Cummins resign was "related to the opportunity to provide a fresh start with a new person in that position."
- The Department is not aware of Karl Rove playing any role in the decision to appoint Griffin.

In conclusion, the Department wholeheartedly agrees with the principle that "[o]nce appointed, U.S. Attorneys, perhaps more than any other public servants, must be above politics and beyond reproach; they must be seen to enforce the rule of law without fear or favor." That many U.S. Attorneys, appointed by Presidents of both parties, have had political experience prior to their appointment does not undermine that principle.

Sincerely,

Richard A. Hertling
Acting Assistant Attorney General

Elston, Michael (ODAG)

From: Margolis, David
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 9:23 AM
To: Sampson, Kyle; McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Hertling, Richard; Goodling, Monica
Subject: RE: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin

Kyle: remind me - did Tim spend a substantial period of time in Crm Div.? I just don't recall. Otherwise I have no qualms about the letter.

From: Sampson, Kyle
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2007 7:22 PM
To: McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Margolis, David; Hertling, Richard; Goodling, Monica
Subject: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin
Importance: High

All, can you please review and provide comments on my draft response to the above-referenced letter?
Richard, can you send the .pdf version of the above-referenced letter around to this group?
Thanks!

<< File: reid letter re cummins-griffin.doc >>

Kyle Sampson
Chief of Staff
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530
(202) 514-2001 wk.
(202) 305-5289 cell
kyle.sampson@usdoj.gov

Elston, Michael (ODAG)

From: Sampson, Kyle
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 10:16 AM
To: Margolis, David; McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Hertling, Richard; Goodling, Monica
Subject: RE: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin

Monica, can you tell us how long Tim was in CRM?

From: Margolis, David
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 9:23 AM
To: Sampson, Kyle; McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Hertling, Richard; Goodling, Monica
Subject: RE: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin

Kyle: remind me - did Tim spend a substantial period of time in Crm Div.? I just don't recall. Otherwise I have no qualms about the letter.

From: Sampson, Kyle
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2007 7:22 PM
To: McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Margolis, David; Hertling, Richard; Goodling, Monica
Subject: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin
Importance: High

All, can you please review and provide comments on my draft response to the above-referenced letter?

Richard, can you send the .pdf version of the above-referenced letter around to this group?

Thanks!

<< File: reid letter re cummins-griffin.doc >>

Kyle Sampson
Chief of Staff
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530
(202) 514-2001 wk.
(202) 305-5289 cell
kyle.sampson@usdoj.gov

Elston, Michael (ODAG)

From: Hertling, Richard
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 10:18 AM
To: Sampson, Kyle; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Margolis, David; Goodling, Monica; McNulty, Paul J
Subject: FW: Schumer/Reid/Durbin/Murray 2/8/07 Letter Re USA Bud Cummins
Attachments: Schumer.Reid.Durbin.Murray 2.8.07 Letter Re USA Bud Cummins.pdf

As Kyle requested, here is the letter to which the draft letter on Griffin circulated last night responds.

From: Cabral, Catalina
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 10:11 AM
To: Hertling, Richard
Subject: Schumer/Reid/Durbin/Murray 2/8/07 Letter Re USA Bud Cummins



Schumer.Reid.Durbin.Murray 2.8...

Catalina Cabral
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
Office of Legislative Affairs
Catalina.Cabral@USDOJ.gov
(202) 514-4828

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, DC 20510

February 8, 2007

The Honorable Alberto R. Gonzales
Attorney General of the United States
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530-0001

Dear Attorney General Gonzales:

As you know, the Senate Judiciary Committee held a hearing this week to examine the growing politicization of the hiring and firing of United States Attorneys, our nation's top federal prosecutors.

Unfortunately, the hearing only served to intensify, rather than assuage, our concerns, particularly given the circumstances surrounding the ouster of Bud Cummins, who was the U.S. Attorney in the Eastern District of Arkansas until last December.

When you testified before the Committee on January 18, 2007, you stated unequivocally that you "would never, ever make a change in a U.S. Attorney position for political reasons." In a stunning admission, however, Deputy Attorney General Paul McNulty, in his own testimony on February 6th, acknowledged that Mr. Cummins was pushed out for no reason other than to install – without Senate confirmation – Tim Griffin, a former aide to Karl Rove. At the time, Mr. Griffin had minimal federal prosecution experience, but was highly skilled in opposition research and partisan attacks for the Republican National Committee. This strikes us as a quintessentially "political" reason to make a change.

We recognize, of course, that United States Attorneys serve at the pleasure of the President, but as several highly respected and distinguished former officials of the Department of Justice have noted, the dismissal of a well-respected U.S. Attorney simply to reward an inexperienced partisan is unprecedented.

Although Senators expect soon to be briefed privately about the alleged performance issues of several other U.S. Attorneys, we hope that you will quickly and publicly address the most troubling aspects of the Cummins ouster and Griffin appointment. We look forward to a fuller explanation of why a concededly well-performing prosecutor was terminated in favor of such a partisan figure:

- In particular, when was the decision made to appoint Tim Griffin to replace Bud Cummins?


- Specifically, who lobbied on behalf of Tim Griffin's appointment, both inside and outside the Administration?
- Why was Bud Cummins told to resign in June of 2006, when the other dismissed officials were told in December of 2006? Was the reason to give the replacement, Tim Griffin, a chance to become ensconced at the U.S. Attorney's Office in Arkansas before making the appointment?
- In light of the unprecedented nature of the appointment, we are especially interested in understanding the role played by Karl Rove. In particular, what role did Karl Rove, with whom Griffin was closely associated, play in the decision to appoint Griffin?


Given that Mr. Rove was himself apparently still being investigated by a U.S. Attorney in June of 2006, it would be extremely untoward if he were at the same time leading the charge to oust a sitting U.S. Attorney and install his own former aide.

These questions go to the heart of the public's confidence in the fair administration of justice. Once appointed, U.S. Attorneys, perhaps more than any other public servant, must be above politics and beyond reproach; they must be seen to enforce the rule of law without fear or favor.


Given the issues raised in the recent hearing, we are naturally concerned about the Administration's professed commitment to keeping politics out of the Department of Justice. We hope that you will quickly put those concerns to rest.

Sincerely,









Elston, Michael (ODAG)

From: Goodling, Monica
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 12:01 PM
To: Sampson, Kyle; Margolis, David; McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Hertling, Richard
Subject: RE: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin

He was technically an employee of Crim Div from March 2001 to June 2002, but was on detail to EDAR for September 2001-June 2002 -- so about 6 months in Crim Div.

From: Sampson, Kyle
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 10:16 AM
To: Margolis, David; McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Hertling, Richard; Goodling, Monica
Subject: RE: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin

Monica, can you tell us how long Tim was in CRM?

From: Margolis, David
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 9:23 AM
To: Sampson, Kyle; McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Hertling, Richard; Goodling, Monica
Subject: RE: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin

Kyle: remind me - did Tim spend a substantial period of time in Crm Div.? I just don't recall. Otherwise I have no qualms about the letter.

From: Sampson, Kyle
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2007 7:22 PM
To: McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Margolis, David; Hertling, Richard; Goodling, Monica
Subject: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin
Importance: High

All, can you please review and provide comments on my draft response to the above-referenced letter?
Richard, can you send the .pdf version of the above-referenced letter around to this group?
Thanks!

<< File: reid letter re cummins-griffin.doc >>

Kyle Sampson
Chief of Staff
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530
(202) 514-2001 wk.
(202) 305-5289 cell
kyle.sampson@usdoj.gov

Elston, Michael (ODAG)

From: Sampson, Kyle
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 12:03 PM
To: Goodling, Monica; Margolis, David; McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Hertling, Richard
Subject: RE: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin
Importance: High
Attachments: reid letter re cummins-griffin v.2.doc

If you have not already reviewed the letter, please review this version 2. (It includes some nits, plus a new graf from Hertling.) Because this letter mentions Rove and alludes to Harriet, I'd like to send it to WHCO today for their review, with an eye on getting it out tomorrow. THx.



reid letter re
cummins-griffin...

From: Goodling, Monica
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 12:01 PM
To: Sampson, Kyle; Margolis, David; McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Hertling, Richard
Subject: RE: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin

He was technically an employee of Crim Div from March 2001 to June 2002, but was on detail to EDAR for September 2001-June 2002 -- so about 6 months in Crim Div.

From: Sampson, Kyle
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 10:16 AM
To: Margolis, David; McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Hertling, Richard; Goodling, Monica
Subject: RE: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin

Monica, can you tell us how long Tim was in CRM?

From: Margolis, David
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 9:23 AM
To: Sampson, Kyle; McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Hertling, Richard; Goodling, Monica
Subject: RE: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin

Kyle: remind me - did Tim spend a substantial period of time in Crm Div.? I just don't recall. Otherwise I have no qualms about the letter.

From: Sampson, Kyle
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2007 7:22 PM
To: McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Margolis, David; Hertling, Richard; Goodling, Monica
Subject: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin
Importance: High

All, can you please review and provide comments on my draft response to the above-referenced letter?
Richard, can you send the .pdf version of the above-referenced letter around to this group?
Thanks!

<< File: reid letter re cummins-griffin.doc >>

Kyle Sampson
Chief of Staff
U.S. Department of Justice

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530
(202) 514-2001 wk.
(202) 305-5289 cell
kyle.sampson@usdoj.gov

The Honorable Harry Reid
Majority Leader
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Reid:

This is in response to your letter to the Attorney General dated February 8, 2007. An identical response has been sent to the other signatories of that letter.

The full quotation of the Attorney General's testimony at the Judiciary Committee hearing on January 18, 2007 (not the selective quote cited in your letter), more fairly represents his views about the appropriate reasons for asking a U.S. Attorney to resign. In full, the Attorney General stated: "I think I would never, ever make a change in a United States attorney for political reasons or *if it would in any way jeopardize an ongoing serious investigation. I just would not do it*" (emphasis added).

The Deputy Attorney General, at the hearing held on February 6, 2007, further stated the Department's view that asking U.S. Attorney Bud Cummins to resign so that Special Assistant U.S. Attorney Tim Griffin might have the opportunity to serve as U.S. Attorney is not, in the Department's view, an inappropriate "political reason." This is so, the Deputy Attorney General testified because, *inter alia*, Mr. Griffin is very well-qualified and has "a strong enough resume" to serve as U.S. Attorney, and Mr. Cummins "may have already been thinking about leaving at some point anyway." Indeed, at the time Mr. Griffin was appointed interim U.S. Attorney in December 2006 he had far more federal prosecution experience (in the Criminal Division and in the U.S. Attorney's office) than Mr. Cummins did at the time he was confirmed as U.S. Attorney in December 2001. In addition, Mr. Griffin has substantial military prosecution experience that Mr. Cummins does not have. And it was well-known, as early as December 2004, that Mr. Cummins intended to leave the office and seek employment in the private sector. See "The Insider Dec. 30," *Ark. Times* (Dec. 30, 2004) ("Cummins, 45, said that, with four children to put through college someday, he'll likely begin exploring career options. It wouldn't be 'shocking,' he said, for there to be a change in his office before the end of Bush's second term.").

In addition, the Department does not consider the replacement of one Republican U.S. Attorney by another well-qualified person with extensive experience as a prosecutor and strong ties to the district to be a change made for "political reasons." U.S. Attorneys serve at the pleasure of the President; that has always been the rule, and U.S. Attorneys accept their appointment with that understanding. U.S. Attorneys leave office all the time for a wide variety of reasons. As noted in the case of Mr. Cummins, he had previously

indicated publicly that he did not expect to remain in office through the President's second term. It was only natural and appropriate that the Department would seek a successor in anticipation of the potential vacancy. When the Department found an able and experienced successor, it moved forward with his interim appointment.

In answer to your specific questions:

- The decision to appoint Tim Griffin to be interim U.S. Attorney in the Eastern District of Arkansas was made on or about December 15, 2006, after the second of the Attorney General's telephone conversations with Senator Pryor.
- The Department of Justice is not aware of anyone lobbying, either inside or outside of the Administration, for Mr. Griffin's appointment. In the spring of 2006, following regular procedures, the Office of the Counsel to the President inquired of the Office of the Attorney General as to whether Mr. Griffin (who then was on active military duty in Iraq) might be considered for appointment as U.S. Attorney upon his return.
- As the Deputy Attorney General testified, Mr. Cummins's continued service as U.S. Attorney was not considered at the same time as the other U.S. Attorneys that the Deputy Attorney General acknowledged were asked to resign for reasons related to their performance. As the Deputy Attorney General testified, the request that Mr. Cummins resign was "related to the opportunity to provide a fresh start with a new person in that position."
- The Department is not aware of Karl Rove playing any role in the decision to appoint Mr. Griffin.

In conclusion, the Department wholeheartedly agrees with the principle you set forth in your letter that "[o]nce appointed, U.S. Attorneys, perhaps more than any other public servants, must be above politics and beyond reproach; they must be seen to enforce the rule of law without fear or favor." That many U.S. Attorneys, appointed by Presidents of both parties, have had political experience prior to their appointment does not undermine that principle.

We appreciate the opportunity to respond to your inquiry.

Sincerely,

Richard A. Hertling
Acting Assistant Attorney General

DAG000002266

Elston, Michael (ODAG)

From: Moschella, William
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 3:20 PM
To: Sampson, Kyle; Goodling, Monica; Margolis, David; McNulty, Paul J; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Hertling, Richard
Subject: RE: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin

No objection but would copy Specter and McConnell.

From: Sampson, Kyle
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 12:03 PM
To: Goodling, Monica; Margolis, David; McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Hertling, Richard
Subject: RE: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin
Importance: High

If you have not already reviewed the letter, please review this version 2. (It includes some nits, plus a new graf from Hertling.) Because this letter mentions Rove and alludes to Harriet, I'd like to send it to WHCO today for their review, with an eye on getting it out tomorrow. THx.

<< File: reid letter re cummins-griffin v.2.doc >>

From: Goodling, Monica
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 12:01 PM
To: Sampson, Kyle; Margolis, David; McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Hertling, Richard
Subject: RE: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin

He was technically an employee of Crim Div from March 2001 to June 2002, but was on detail to EDAR for September 2001-June 2002 -- so about 6 months in Crim Div.

From: Sampson, Kyle
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 10:16 AM
To: Margolis, David; McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Hertling, Richard; Goodling, Monica
Subject: RE: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin

Monica, can you tell us how long Tim was in CRM?

From: Margolis, David
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 9:23 AM
To: Sampson, Kyle; McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Hertling, Richard; Goodling, Monica
Subject: RE: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin

Kyle: remind me - did Tim spend a substantial period of time in Crm Div.? I just don't recall. Otherwise I have no qualms about the letter.

From: Sampson, Kyle
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2007 7:22 PM
To: McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Margolis, David; Hertling, Richard; Goodling, Monica
Subject: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin
Importance: High

All, can you please review and provide comments on my draft response to the above-referenced letter? Richard, can you send the .pdf version of the above-referenced letter around to this group? Thanks!

<< File: reid letter re cummins-griffin.doc >>

Kyle Sampson
Chief of Staff
U.S. Department of Justice

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530
(202) 514-2001 wk.
(202) 305-5289 cell
kyle.sampson@usdoj.gov

The Honorable Harry Reid
Majority Leader
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Reid:

This is in response to your letter to the Attorney General dated February 8, 2007. An identical response has been sent to the other signatories of that letter.

The full quotation of the Attorney General's testimony at the Judiciary Committee hearing on January 18, 2007 (not the selective quote cited in your letter), more fairly represents his views about the appropriate reasons for asking a U.S. Attorney to resign. In full, the Attorney General stated: "I think I would never, ever make a change in a United States attorney for political reasons or *if it would in any way jeopardize an ongoing serious investigation. I just would not do it*" (emphasis added).

The Deputy Attorney General, at the hearing held on February 6, 2007, further stated the Department's view that asking U.S. Attorney Bud Cummins to resign so that Special Assistant U.S. Attorney Tim Griffin might have the opportunity to serve as U.S. Attorney is not, in the Department's view, an inappropriate "political reason." This is so, the Deputy Attorney General testified because, *inter alia*, Mr. Griffin is very well-qualified and has "a strong enough resume" to serve as U.S. Attorney, and Mr. Cummins "may have already been thinking about leaving at some point anyway." Indeed, at the time Mr. Griffin was appointed interim U.S. Attorney in December 2006 he had far more federal prosecution experience (in the Criminal Division and in the U.S. Attorney's office) than Mr. Cummins did at the time he was confirmed as U.S. Attorney in December 2001. In addition, Mr. Griffin has substantial military prosecution experience that Mr. Cummins does not have. And it was well-known, as early as December 2004, that Mr. Cummins intended to leave the office and seek employment in the private sector. See "The Insider Dec. 30," *Ark. Times* (Dec. 30, 2004) ("Cummins, 45, said that, with four children to put through college someday, he'll likely begin exploring career options. It wouldn't be 'shocking,' he said, for there to be a change in his office before the end of Bush's second term.").

In addition, the Department does not consider the replacement of one Republican U.S. Attorney by another well-qualified person with extensive experience as a prosecutor and strong ties to the district to be a change made for "political reasons." U.S. Attorneys serve at the pleasure of the President; that has always been the rule, and U.S. Attorneys accept their appointment with that understanding. U.S. Attorneys leave office all the time for a wide variety of reasons. As noted in the case of Mr. Cummins, he had previously

indicated publicly that he did not expect to remain in office through the President's second term. It was only natural and appropriate that the Department would seek a successor in anticipation of the potential vacancy. When the Department found an able and experienced successor, it moved forward with his interim appointment.

In answer to your specific questions:

- The decision to appoint Tim Griffin to be interim U.S. Attorney in the Eastern District of Arkansas was made on or about December 15, 2006, after the second of the Attorney General's telephone conversations with Senator Pryor.
- The Department of Justice is not aware of anyone lobbying, either inside or outside of the Administration, for Mr. Griffin's appointment. In the spring of 2006, following regular procedures, the Office of the Counsel to the President inquired of the Office of the Attorney General as to whether Mr. Griffin (who then was on active military duty in Iraq) might be considered for appointment as U.S. Attorney upon his return.
- As the Deputy Attorney General testified, Mr. Cummins's continued service as U.S. Attorney was not considered at the same time as the other U.S. Attorneys that the Deputy Attorney General acknowledged were asked to resign for reasons related to their performance. As the Deputy Attorney General testified, the request that Mr. Cummins resign was "related to the opportunity to provide a fresh start with a new person in that position."
- The Department is not aware of Karl Rove playing any role in the decision to appoint Mr. Griffin.

In conclusion, the Department wholeheartedly agrees with the principle you set forth in your letter that "[o]nce appointed, U.S. Attorneys, perhaps more than any other public servants, must be above politics and beyond reproach; they must be seen to enforce the rule of law without fear or favor." That many U.S. Attorneys, appointed by Presidents of both parties, have had political experience prior to their appointment does not undermine that principle.

We appreciate the opportunity to respond to your inquiry.

Sincerely,

Richard A. Hertling
Acting Assistant Attorney General

DAG000002270

Elston, Michael (ODAG)

From: Elston, Michael (ODAG)
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 4:19 PM
To: Keasley, Monica (ODAG)
Subject: Fw: Schumer/Reid/Durbin/Murray 2/8/07 Letter Re USA Bud Cummins

Attachments: Schumer.Reid.Durbin.Murray 2.8.07 Letter Re USA Bud Cummins.pdf

Please print attachment for me.

-----Original Message-----

From: Hertling, Richard
To: Sampson, Kyle; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Margolis, David; Goodling, Monica; McNulty, Paul J
Sent: Thu Feb 22 10:17:31 2007
Subject: FW: Schumer/Reid/Durbin/Murray 2/8/07 Letter Re USA Bud Cummins

As Kyle requested, here is the letter to which the draft letter on Griffin circulated last night responds.

From: Cabral, Catalina
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 10:11 AM
To: Hertling, Richard
Subject: Schumer/Reid/Durbin/Murray 2/8/07 Letter Re USA Bud Cummins



Schumer.Reid.Durbin.Murray 2.8...

<<Schumer.Reid.Durbin.Murray 2.8.07 Letter Re USA Bud Cummins.pdf>>

Catalina Cabral
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
Office of Legislative Affairs
Catalina.Cabral@USDOJ.gov
(202) 514-4828

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, DC 20510

February 8, 2007

The Honorable Alberto R. Gonzales
Attorney General of the United States
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530-0001

Dear Attorney General Gonzales:

As you know, the Senate Judiciary Committee held a hearing this week to examine the growing politicization of the hiring and firing of United States Attorneys, our nation's top federal prosecutors.

Unfortunately, the hearing only served to intensify, rather than assuage, our concerns, particularly given the circumstances surrounding the ouster of Bud Cummins, who was the U.S. Attorney in the Eastern District of Arkansas until last December.

When you testified before the Committee on January 18, 2007, you stated unequivocally that you "would never, ever make a change in a U.S. Attorney position for political reasons." In a stunning admission, however, Deputy Attorney General Paul McNulty, in his own testimony on February 6th, acknowledged that Mr. Cummins was pushed out for no reason other than to install – without Senate confirmation – Tim Griffin, a former aide to Karl Rove. At the time, Mr. Griffin had minimal federal prosecution experience, but was highly skilled in opposition research and partisan attacks for the Republican National Committee. This strikes us as a quintessentially "political" reason to make a change.

We recognize, of course, that United States Attorneys serve at the pleasure of the President, but as several highly respected and distinguished former officials of the Department of Justice have noted, the dismissal of a well-respected U.S. Attorney simply to reward an inexperienced partisan is unprecedented.

Although Senators expect soon to be briefed privately about the alleged performance issues of several other U.S. Attorneys, we hope that you will quickly and publicly address the most troubling aspects of the Cummins ouster and Griffin appointment. We look forward to a fuller explanation of why a concededly well-performing prosecutor was terminated in favor of such a partisan figure:

- In particular, when was the decision made to appoint Tim Griffin to replace Bud Cummins?

- Specifically, who lobbied on behalf of Tim Griffin's appointment, both inside and outside the Administration?
- Why was Bud Cummins told to resign in June of 2006, when the other dismissed officials were told in December of 2006? Was the reason to give the replacement, Tim Griffin, a chance to become ensconced at the U.S. Attorney's Office in Arkansas before making the appointment?
- In light of the unprecedented nature of the appointment, we are especially interested in understanding the role played by Karl Rove. In particular, what role did Karl Rove, with whom Griffin was closely associated, play in the decision to appoint Griffin?

Given that Mr. Rove was himself apparently still being investigated by a U.S. Attorney in June of 2006, it would be extremely untoward if he were at the same time leading the charge to oust a sitting U.S. Attorney and install his own former aide.

These questions go to the heart of the public's confidence in the fair administration of justice. Once appointed, U.S. Attorneys, perhaps more than any other public servant, must be above politics and beyond reproach; they must be seen to enforce the rule of law without fear or favor.

Given the issues raised in the recent hearing, we are naturally concerned about the Administration's professed commitment to keeping politics out of the Department of Justice. We hope that you will quickly put those concerns to rest.

Sincerely,

Harry Reid
Cliff

Dick Durbin
Patty Murray

Elston, Michael (ODAG)

From: Elston, Michael (ODAG)
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 4:28 PM
To: Keasley, Monica (ODAG)
Subject: Re: Schumer/Reid/Durbin/Murray 2/8/07 Letter Re USA Bud Cummins

Could you bring them into me in the conf room?

-----Original Message-----

From: Elston, Michael (ODAG)
To: Keasley, Monica (ODAG)
Sent: Thu Feb 22 16:18:48 2007
Subject: Fw: Schumer/Reid/Durbin/Murray 2/8/07 Letter Re USA Bud Cummins

Please print attachment for me.

-----Original Message-----

From: Hertling, Richard
To: Sampson, Kyle; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Margolis, David; Goodling, Monica; McNulty, Paul J
Sent: Thu Feb 22 10:17:31 2007
Subject: FW: Schumer/Reid/Durbin/Murray 2/8/07 Letter Re USA Bud Cummins

As Kyle requested, here is the letter to which the draft letter on Griffin circulated last night responds.

From: Cabral, Catalina
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 10:11 AM
To: Hertling, Richard
Subject: Schumer/Reid/Durbin/Murray 2/8/07 Letter Re USA Bud Cummins

<<Schumer.Reid.Durbin.Murray 2.8.07 Letter Re USA Bud Cummins.pdf>>

Catalina Cabral
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
Office of Legislative Affairs
Catalina.Cabral@USDOJ.gov
(202) 514-4828

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, DC 20510

February 8, 2007

The Honorable Alberto R. Gonzales
Attorney General of the United States
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530-0001

Dear Attorney General Gonzales:

As you know, the Senate Judiciary Committee held a hearing this week to examine the growing politicization of the hiring and firing of United States Attorneys, our nation's top federal prosecutors.

Unfortunately, the hearing only served to intensify, rather than assuage, our concerns, particularly given the circumstances surrounding the ouster of Bud Cummins, who was the U.S. Attorney in the Eastern District of Arkansas until last December.

When you testified before the Committee on January 18, 2007, you stated unequivocally that you "would never, ever make a change in a U.S. Attorney position for political reasons." In a stunning admission, however, Deputy Attorney General Paul McNulty, in his own testimony on February 6th, acknowledged that Mr. Cummins was pushed out for no reason other than to install - without Senate confirmation - Tim Griffin, a former aide to Karl Rove. At the time, Mr. Griffin had minimal federal prosecution experience, but was highly skilled in opposition research and partisan attacks for the Republican National Committee. This strikes us as a quintessentially "political" reason to make a change.

We recognize, of course, that United States Attorneys serve at the pleasure of the President, but as several highly respected and distinguished former officials of the Department of Justice have noted, the dismissal of a well-respected U.S. Attorney simply to reward an inexperienced partisan is unprecedented.

Although Senators expect soon to be briefed privately about the alleged performance issues of several other U.S. Attorneys, we hope that you will quickly and publicly address the most troubling aspects of the Cummins ouster and Griffin appointment. We look forward to a fuller explanation of why a concededly well-performing prosecutor was terminated in favor of such a partisan figure:

- In particular, when was the decision made to appoint Tim Griffin to replace Bud Cummins?



- Specifically, who lobbied on behalf of Tim Griffin's appointment, both inside and outside the Administration?
- Why was Bud Cummins told to resign in June of 2006, when the other dismissed officials were told in December of 2006? Was the reason to give the replacement, Tim Griffin, a chance to become ensconced at the U.S. Attorney's Office in Arkansas before making the appointment?
- In light of the unprecedented nature of the appointment, we are especially interested in understanding the role played by Karl Rove. In particular, what role did Karl Rove, with whom Griffin was closely associated, play in the decision to appoint Griffin?


Given that Mr. Rove was himself apparently still being investigated by a U.S. Attorney in June of 2006, it would be extremely untoward if he were at the same time leading the charge to oust a sitting U.S. Attorney and install his own former aide.

These questions go to the heart of the public's confidence in the fair administration of justice. Once appointed, U.S. Attorneys, perhaps more than any other public servant, must be above politics and beyond reproach; they must be seen to enforce the rule of law without fear or favor.

Given the issues raised in the recent hearing, we are naturally concerned about the Administration's professed commitment to keeping politics out of the Department of Justice. We hope that you will quickly put those concerns to rest.

Sincerely,

Moschella, William

From: Sampson, Kyle
Sent: Thursday, February 08, 2007 4:15 PM
To: Goodling, Monica; McNulty, Paul J; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Moschella, William; Hertling, Richard; Scolinos, Tasia
Subject: FW: Letter to Gonzales 2.8.07
Attachments: Document.pdf

My thoughts re the response:

- The full quotation (not the selective quote) of the AG's testimony more fairly represents his views about not asking U.S. Attorney to resign for so-called "political reasons," to wit: "I think I would never, ever make a change in a United States attorney for political reasons or **if it would in any way jeopardize an ongoing serious investigation. I just would not do it**" (emphasis added).
- The DAG's testimony clarifies that asking Cummins to resign, not because of underperformance, but to permit Griffin to serve, is not a "political reason":

SEN. SCHUMER: . . . So here we have the attorney general adamant; here's his quote, "We would never, ever make a change in the U.S. attorney position for political reasons." Then we have now -- for the first time, we learn that Bud Cummins was asked to leave for no reason and we're putting in someone who has all kinds of political connections -- not disqualifiers, obviously, certainly not legally -- and I'm sure it's been done by other administrations as well. But do you believe that firing a well-performing U.S. attorney to make way for a political operative is not a political reason?

MR. MCNULTY: Yes, I believe that's it's **not** a political reason.

SEN. SCHUMER: Okay, could you try to explain yourself there?

MR. MCNULTY: . . . I think that the fact that he had political activities in his background does not speak to the question of his qualifications for being the United States attorney in that district. . . . So he started off with a strong enough resume, and the fact that he was given an opportunity to step in -- . . . [where Cummins] may have already been thinking about leaving at some point anyway. . . . And all those things came together to say in this case, this unique situation, we can make a change and this would still be good for the office.

- Griffin is not an inexperienced prosecutor: he had far more federal prosecution experience (in the Criminal Division and in the U.S. Attorney's Office) than Cummins did when he was appointed, in addition to substantial military prosecution experience.

As for the specific questions:

- The decision to appoint Tim Griffin to be interim U.S. Attorney in the Eastern District of Arkansas was made on or about December 15, 2006, after the second of the Attorney General's telephone conversations with Sen. Pryor. Appointing Griffin to be U.S. Attorney (for the Western District of Arkansas) was first contemplated in the spring of 2004 [Monica, please verify], when Griffin was one of three names recommended by Rep. Boozman to fill the U.S. Attorney vacancy in that district that arose because of the resignation of Tom Gean on [insert date]; ultimately, Griffin withdrew his name from consideration for that appointment. Appointing Griffin to be U.S. Attorney (for the Eastern District of Arkansas) was first contemplated in the spring of 2006 [Monica, please verify], after Griffin had left the employment of the White House due to his being activated for full-time military service.
- I am not aware of anyone (other than Mr. Griffin) lobbying, either inside or outside of the Administration, for appointment. In the spring of 2006 [Monica, please verify], White House Counsel Harriet Miers asked the Department if Mr. Griffin (who then was on active duty) could be considered for appointment as U.S.

Attorney upon his return from Iraq. As Griffin was well known to the Department (from his service in the Criminal Division, the U.S. Attorney's Office, and the White House), this request was considered favorably.

- Cummins' continued service as U.S. Attorney was not considered at the same time as the other U.S. Attorneys that the DAG acknowledged were asked to resign for reasons related to their performance. As the DAG testified, with regard to Cummins' continued service, "there was a change made there that was not connected to, as was said, the performance of the incumbent, but more related to the opportunity to provide a fresh start with a new person in that position." (Or where the DAG testified that he was "not disputing [the] characterization" that Cummins was "fired simply to let someone else have a shot at the job.")
- I am not aware of Karl Rove playing any role in the Attorney General's decision to appoint Griffin.
- Agree wholeheartedly that "[o]nce appointed, U.S. Attorneys, perhaps more than any other public servance, must be above politics and beyond reproach; they must be seen to enforce the rule of law without fear or favor." Historically, many U.S. Attorneys, prior to their appointment have political experience.
- Hertling should sign.

From: Scott-Finan, Nancy

Sent: Thursday, February 08, 2007 1:25 PM

To: Sampson, Kyle; Goodling, Monica; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Moschella, William; Hertling, Richard; Seidel, Rebecca; Scolinos, Tasia

Cc: Cabral, Catalina; Long, Linda E; Green, Saralene E

Subject: FW: Letter to Gonzales 2.8.07

Senator Schumer's press secretary just emailed me this Schumer/Reid/Durbin/Murray letter with regard to Cummins/Griffin.

Moschella, William

From: Sampson, Kyle
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2007 7:22 PM
To: McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Margolis, David; Hertling, Richard; Goodling, Monica
Subject: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin
Importance: High
Attachments: reid letter re cummins-griffin.doc

All, can you please review and provide comments on my draft response to the above-referenced letter?
Richard, can you send the .pdf version of the above-referenced letter around to this group?
Thanks!



reid letter re
cummins-griffin...

Kyle Sampson
Chief of Staff
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530
(202) 514-2001 wk.
(202) 305-5289 cell
kyle.sampson@usdoj.gov

The Honorable Harry Reid
Majority Leader
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Reid:

This is in response to your letter to the Attorney General dated February 8, 2007. An identical response has been sent to the other signatories of that letter.

The full quotation of the Attorney General's testimony at the Judiciary Committee hearing on January 18, 2007 (not the selective quote cited in your letter), more fairly represents his views about the appropriate reasons for asking a U.S. Attorney to resign. In full, the Attorney General stated: "I think I would never, ever make a change in a United States attorney for political reasons or *if it would in any way jeopardize an ongoing serious investigation. I just would not do it*" (emphasis added).

The Deputy Attorney General, at the hearing held on February 6, 2007, further stated the Department's view that asking U.S. Attorney Bud Cummins to resign so that Special Assistant U.S. Attorney Tim Griffin might have the opportunity to serve as U.S. Attorney is not, in the Department's view, an inappropriate "political reason." This is so, the Deputy Attorney General testified because, *inter alia*, Griffin was very well-qualified and had "a strong enough resume" to serve as U.S. Attorney, and Cummins "may have already been thinking about leaving at some point anyway." Indeed, at the time Griffin was appointed interim U.S. Attorney in December 2006 he had far more federal prosecution experience (in the Criminal Division and in the U.S. Attorney's office) than Cummins did at the time he was appointed U.S. Attorney in [insert month] 2001. In addition, Griffin has substantial military prosecution experience that Cummins does not have. And it was well-known, as early as December 2004, that Cummins intended to leave the office and seek employment in the private sector. See "The Insider Dec. 30," *Ark. Times* (Dec. 30, 2004) ("Cummins, 45, said that, with four children to put through college someday, he'll likely begin exploring career options. It wouldn't be 'shocking,' he said, for there to be a change in his office before the end of Bush's second term.").

In answer to your specific questions:

- The decision to appoint Tim Griffin to be interim U.S. Attorney in the Eastern District of Arkansas was made on or about December 15, 2006, after the second of the Attorney General's telephone conversations with Senator Pryor.
- The Department of Justice is not aware of anyone lobbying, either inside or outside of the Administration, for Griffin's appointment. In the spring of 2006,

DAG000002280

following regular procedures, the Office of the Counsel to the President inquired of the Office of the Attorney General as to whether Griffin (who then was on active military duty) might be considered for appointment as U.S. Attorney upon his return from Iraq.

- As the Deputy Attorney General testified, Cummins' continued service as U.S. Attorney was not considered at the same time as the other U.S. Attorneys that the Deputy Attorney General acknowledged were asked to resign for reasons related to their performance. As the Deputy Attorney General testified, the request that Cummins resign was "related to the opportunity to provide a fresh start with a new person in that position."
- The Department is not aware of Karl Rove playing any role in the decision to appoint Griffin.

In conclusion, the Department wholeheartedly agrees with the principle that "[o]nce appointed, U.S. Attorneys, perhaps more than any other public servants, must be above politics and beyond reproach; they must be seen to enforce the rule of law without fear or favor." That many U.S. Attorneys, appointed by Presidents of both parties, have had political experience prior to their appointment does not undermine that principle.

Sincerely,

Richard A. Hertling
Acting Assistant Attorney General

Moschella, William

From: Hertling, Richard
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 10:18 AM
To: Sampson, Kyle; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Margolis, David; Goodling, Monica; McNulty, Paul J
Subject: FW: Schumer/Reid/Durbin/Murray 2/8/07 Letter Re USA Bud Cummins
Attachments: Schumer.Reid.Durbin.Murray 2.8.07 Letter Re USA Bud Cummins.pdf

As Kyle requested, here is the letter to which the draft letter on Griffin circulated last night responds.

From: Cabral, Catalina
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 10:11 AM
To: Hertling, Richard
Subject: Schumer/Reid/Durbin/Murray 2/8/07 Letter Re USA Bud Cummins



Schumer.Reid.Durbin.Murray 2.8...

Catalina Cabral
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
Office of Legislative Affairs
Catalina.Cabral@USDOJ.gov
(202) 514-4828

Moschella, William

From: Goodling, Monica
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 12:01 PM
To: Sampson, Kyle; Margolis, David; McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Hertling, Richard
Subject: RE: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin

He was technically an employee of Crim Div from March 2001 to June 2002, but was on detail to EDAR for September 2001-June 2002 – so about 6 months in Crim Div.

From: Sampson, Kyle
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 10:16 AM
To: Margolis, David; McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Hertling, Richard; Goodling, Monica
Subject: RE: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin

Monica, can you tell us how long Tim was in CRM?

From: Margolis, David
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 9:23 AM
To: Sampson, Kyle; McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Hertling, Richard; Goodling, Monica
Subject: RE: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin

Kyle: remind me - did Tim spend a substantial period of time in Crm Div.? I just don't recall. Otherwise I have no qualms about the letter.

From: Sampson, Kyle
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2007 7:22 PM
To: McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Margolis, David; Hertling, Richard; Goodling, Monica
Subject: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin
Importance: High

All, can you please review and provide comments on my draft response to the above-referenced letter?
Richard, can you send the .pdf version of the above-referenced letter around to this group?
Thanks!

<< File: reid letter re cummins-griffin.doc >>

Kyle Sampson
Chief of Staff
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530
(202) 514-2001 wk.
(202) 305-5289 cell
kyle.sampson@usdoj.gov

Moschella, William

From: Sampson, Kyle
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 12:03 PM
To: Goodling, Monica; Margolis, David; McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Hertling, Richard
Subject: RE: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin
Importance: High
Attachments: reid letter re cummins-griffin v.2.doc

If you have not already reviewed the letter, please review this version 2. (It includes some nits, plus a new graf from Hertling.) Because this letter mentions Rove and alludes to Harriet, I'd like to send it to WHCO today for their review, with an eye on getting it out tomorrow. THx.



reid letter re
cummins-griffin...

From: Goodling, Monica
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 12:01 PM
To: Sampson, Kyle; Margolis, David; McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Hertling, Richard
Subject: RE: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin

He was technically an employee of Crim Div from March 2001 to June 2002, but was on detail to EDAR for September 2001-June 2002 – so about 6 months in Crim Div.

From: Sampson, Kyle
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 10:16 AM
To: Margolis, David; McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Hertling, Richard; Goodling, Monica
Subject: RE: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin

Monica, can you tell us how long Tim was in CRM?

From: Margolis, David
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 9:23 AM
To: Sampson, Kyle; McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Hertling, Richard; Goodling, Monica
Subject: RE: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin

Kyle: remind me - did Tim spend a substantial period of time in Crm Div.? I just don't recall. Otherwise I have no qualms about the letter.

From: Sampson, Kyle
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2007 7:22 PM
To: McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Margolis, David; Hertling, Richard; Goodling, Monica
Subject: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin
Importance: High

All, can you please review and provide comments on my draft response to the above-referenced letter?
Richard, can you send the .pdf version of the above-referenced letter around to this group?
Thanks!

<< File: reid letter re cummins-griffin.doc >>

Kyle Sampson
Chief of Staff
U.S. Department of Justice

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530
(202) 514-2001 wk.
(202) 305-5289 cell
kyle.sampson@usdoj.gov

Moschella, William

From: Moschella, William
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 3:20 PM
To: Sampson, Kyle; Goodling, Monica; Margolis, David; McNulty, Paul J; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Hertling, Richard
Subject: RE: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin

No objection but would copy Specter and McConnell.

From: Sampson, Kyle
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 12:03 PM
To: Goodling, Monica; Margolis, David; McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Hertling, Richard
Subject: RE: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin
Importance: High

If you have not already reviewed the letter, please review this version 2. (It includes some nits, plus a new graf from Hertling.) Because this letter mentions Rove and alludes to Harriet, I'd like to send it to WHCO today for their review, with an eye on getting it out tomorrow. THX.

<< File: reid letter re cummins-griffin v.2.doc >>

From: Goodling, Monica
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 12:01 PM
To: Sampson, Kyle; Margolis, David; McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Hertling, Richard
Subject: RE: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin

He was technically an employee of Crim Div from March 2001 to June 2002, but was on detail to EDAR for September 2001-June 2002 -- so about 6 months in Crim Div.

From: Sampson, Kyle
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 10:16 AM
To: Margolis, David; McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Hertling, Richard; Goodling, Monica
Subject: RE: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin

Monica, can you tell us how long Tim was in CRM?

From: Margolis, David
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 9:23 AM
To: Sampson, Kyle; McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Hertling, Richard; Goodling, Monica
Subject: RE: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin

Kyle: remind me - did Tim spend a substantial period of time in Crm Div.? I just don't recall. Otherwise I have no qualms about the letter.

From: Sampson, Kyle
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2007 7:22 PM
To: McNulty, Paul J; Moschella, William; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Margolis, David; Hertling, Richard; Goodling, Monica
Subject: Draft response to Reid/Durbin/Schumer/Murray letter re Cummins-Griffin
Importance: High

All, can you please review and provide comments on my draft response to the above-referenced letter?
Richard, can you send the .pdf version of the above-referenced letter around to this group?
Thanks!

<< File: reid letter re cummins-griffin.doc >>

Kyle Sampson
Chief of Staff
U.S. Department of Justice

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530
(202) 514-2001 wk.
(202) 305-5289 cell
kyle.sampson@usdoj.gov

Tracking:

Recipient

Sampson, Kyle
Goodling, Monica
Margolis, David
McNulty, Paul J
Elston, Michael (ODAG)
Hertling, Richard

Read

Read: 2/22/2007 3:35 PM
Read: 2/22/2007 3:43 PM
Read: 2/22/2007 6:09 PM
Read: 2/22/2007 3:56 PM
Read: 2/22/2007 4:26 PM
Read: 2/22/2007 3:24 PM

Department of Justice
EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT
CONTROL SHEET

*Margolis
&
Moschetti*

DATE OF DOCUMENT: 02/08/2007
DATE RECEIVED: 02/09/2007

WORKFLOW ID: 1136273
DUE DATE: 02/27/2007

FROM: The Honorable Charles E. Schumer
United States Senate

Washington, DC 20510

TO: AG

MAIL TYPE: Congressional Priority

SUBJECT: (Copy rec'd from OLA via email) In connection with the DAG's testimony at the 2/6/2007, hearing held by the Senate Judiciary Comte to examine the growing politicization of the hiring and firing of USAs, requests answers to questions pertaining to the appointment of Tim Griffin to replace Bud Cummins, the former USA for the E.D. of AK. Ltr also signed by MCs Reid, Durbin and Murray. See WFs 1135622, 1119916, 1114387 & related corres in ES.

DATE ASSIGNED
02/12/2007

ACTION COMPONENT & ACTION REQUESTED
Executive Office of United States Attorneys
Prepare response for AAG/OLA signature.

INFO COMPONENT: OAG, ODAG, OLP, OLA

COMMENTS:

FILE CODE:

EXECSEC POC: Debbie Alexander: 202-616-0075

DAG000002288

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, DC 20510

February 8, 2007

The Honorable Alberto R. Gonzales
Attorney General of the United States
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530-0001

Dear Attorney General Gonzales:

As you know, the Senate Judiciary Committee held a hearing this week to examine the growing politicization of the hiring and firing of United States Attorneys, our nation's top federal prosecutors.

Unfortunately, the hearing only served to intensify, rather than assuage, our concerns, particularly given the circumstances surrounding the ouster of Bud Cummins, who was the U.S. Attorney in the Eastern District of Arkansas until last December.

When you testified before the Committee on January 18, 2007, you stated unequivocally that you "would never, ever make a change in a U.S. Attorney position for political reasons." In a stunning admission, however, Deputy Attorney General Paul McNulty, in his own testimony on February 6th, acknowledged that Mr. Cummins was pushed out for no reason other than to install - without Senate confirmation - Tim Griffin, a former aide to Karl Rove. At the time, Mr. Griffin had minimal federal prosecution experience, but was highly skilled in opposition research and partisan attacks for the Republican National Committee. This strikes us as a quintessentially "political" reason to make a change.

We recognize, of course, that United States Attorneys serve at the pleasure of the President, but as several highly respected and distinguished former officials of the Department of Justice have noted, the dismissal of a well-respected U.S. Attorney simply to reward an inexperienced partisan is unprecedented.

Although Senators expect soon to be briefed privately about the alleged performance issues of several other U.S. Attorneys, we hope that you will quickly and publicly address the most troubling aspects of the Cummins ouster and Griffin appointment. We look forward to a fuller explanation of why a concededly well-performing prosecutor was terminated in favor of such a partisan figure.

- In particular, when was the decision made to appoint Tim Griffin to replace Bud Cummins?

- Specifically, who lobbied on behalf of Tim Griffin's appointment, both inside and outside the Administration?
- Why was Bud Cummins told to resign in June of 2006, when the other dismissed officials were told in December of 2006? Was the reason to give the replacement, Tim Griffin, a chance to become ensconced at the U.S. Attorney's Office in Arkansas before making the appointment?
- In light of the unprecedented nature of the appointment, we are especially interested in understanding the role played by Karl Rove. In particular, what role did Karl Rove, with whom Griffin was closely associated, play in the decision to appoint Griffin?

Given that Mr. Rove was himself apparently still being investigated by a U.S. Attorney in June of 2006, it would be extremely untoward if he were at the same time leading the charge to oust a sitting U.S. Attorney and install his own former aide.

These questions go to the heart of the public's confidence in the fair administration of justice. Once appointed, U.S. Attorneys, perhaps more than any other public servant, must be above politics and beyond reproach; they must be seen to enforce the rule of law without fear or favor.

Given the issues raised in the recent hearing, we are naturally concerned about the Administration's professed commitment to keeping politics out of the Department of Justice. We hope that you will quickly put those concerns to rest.

Sincerely,

Garry
Chase

Don
Patty Murray

Barnes, Michelle D

From: Green, Saralene E
Sent: Thursday, February 08, 2007 1:32 PM
To: Barnes, Michelle D
Cc: Adkins-Blanch, Chuck (EOIR)
Subject: FW: Letter to Gonzales 2.8.07
Attachments: Document.pdf

Pls log in

From: Scott-Finan, Nancy
Sent: Thursday, February 08, 2007 1:25 PM
To: Sampson, Kyle; Goodling, Monica; Elston, Michael (ODAG); Moschella, William; Hertling, Richard; Seidel, Rebecca; Scolinos, Tasia
Cc: Cabral, Catalina; Long, Linda E; Green, Saralene E
Subject: FW: Letter to Gonzales 2.8.07

Senator Schumer's press secretary just emailed me this Schumer/Reid/Durbin/Murray letter with regard to Cummins/Griffin.

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, DC 20510

February 8, 2007

The Honorable Alberto R. Gonzales
Attorney General of the United States
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530-0001

Dear Attorney General Gonzales:

As you know, the Senate Judiciary Committee held a hearing this week to examine the growing politicization of the hiring and firing of United States Attorneys, our nation's top federal prosecutors.

Unfortunately, the hearing only served to intensify, rather than assuage, our concerns, particularly given the circumstances surrounding the ouster of Bud Cummins, who was the U.S. Attorney in the Eastern District of Arkansas until last December.

When you testified before the Committee on January 18, 2007, you stated unequivocally that you "would never, ever make a change in a U.S. Attorney position for political reasons." In a stunning admission, however, Deputy Attorney General Paul McNulty, in his own testimony on February 6th, acknowledged that Mr. Cummins was pushed out for no reason other than to install – without Senate confirmation – Tim Griffin, a former aide to Karl Rove. At the time, Mr. Griffin had minimal federal prosecution experience, but was highly skilled in opposition research and partisan attacks for the Republican National Committee. This strikes us as a quintessentially "political" reason to make a change.

We recognize, of course, that United States Attorneys serve at the pleasure of the President, but as several highly respected and distinguished former officials of the Department of Justice have noted, the dismissal of a well-respected U.S. Attorney simply to reward an inexperienced partisan is unprecedented.

Although Senators expect soon to be briefed privately about the alleged performance issues of several other U.S. Attorneys, we hope that you will quickly and publicly address the most troubling aspects of the Cummins ouster and Griffin appointment. We look forward to a fuller explanation of why a concededly well-performing prosecutor was terminated in favor of such a partisan figure:

- In particular, when was the decision made to appoint Tim Griffin to replace Bud Cummins?

- Specifically, who lobbied on behalf of Tim Griffin's appointment, both inside and outside the Administration?
- Why was Bud Cummins told to resign in June of 2006, when the other dismissed officials were told in December of 2006? Was the reason to give the replacement, Tim Griffin, a chance to become ensconced at the U.S. Attorney's Office in Arkansas before making the appointment?
- In light of the unprecedented nature of the appointment, we are especially interested in understanding the role played by Karl Rove. In particular, what role did Karl Rove, with whom Griffin was closely associated, play in the decision to appoint Griffin?

Given that Mr. Rove was himself apparently still being investigated by a U.S. Attorney in June of 2006, it would be extremely untoward if he were at the same time leading the charge to oust a sitting U.S. Attorney and install his own former aide.

These questions go to the heart of the public's confidence in the fair administration of justice. Once appointed, U.S. Attorneys, perhaps more than any other public servant, must be above politics and beyond reproach; they must be seen to enforce the rule of law without fear or favor.

Given the issues raised in the recent hearing, we are naturally concerned about the Administration's professed commitment to keeping politics out of the Department of Justice. We hope that you will quickly put those concerns to rest.

Sincerely,

Harry Reid
Cliff

Dick Durbin
Patty Murray